DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 307 JC 890 034

AUTHOR Meznek, James; Murdoch, Allene
TITLE Matriculation: Preliminary Report on First-Year Implementation.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jan 89
NOTE 65p.; Discussed as agenda item number 9 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, January 12-13, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Advising; Admissions Counseling; *College Admission; Community Colleges; Counseling Services; Educational Legislation; School Orientation; State Surveys; Statewide Planning; *Student Personnel Services; Student Placement; Testing Programs; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

Drawing from information submitted by 60 urban, rural, and suburban institutions, this report documents the progress of California's community colleges in implementing the first phase of a statewide matriculation plan. Introductory material defines matriculation as a process that promotes and sustains the efforts of students to reach their educational goals by providing a program of support services. After examining the public policy context of the development of the plan, the report offers a summary of first-year efforts and presents findings concerning the implementation of various components of the matriculation plan at the 60 responding colleges. Progress is examined for the following activities: admissions, orientation, student assessment and placement, counseling, student follow-up, coordination and staff training, and institutional research and evaluation. Selected findings include the following: (1) during the 10-month funding period, 40% of the students who enrolled in credit courses at the colleges received core matriculation services; (2) 40% of the colleges had developed or revised admissions forms to gather matriculation-related data; (3) 28% had developed orientation materials; (4) colleges were exempting students from the matriculation process on a number of bases, including prior educational experience and types of courses or unit load; and (5) at 69% of the colleges, assessment was mandatory for non-exempt students. Data on funding and expenditures in 1987-88 are also provided. Appendixes include a review of the college progress reports by an external agency and the matriculation plan. (AACZ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302307

MATRICULATION:

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON FIRST-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION

James Meznek

Allene Murdoch

Prepared as agenda item number 9 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, January 12-13, 1989.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

JC 890 034

MATRICULATION: PRELIMINARY REPORT ON FIRST-YEAR IMPLEMENTATION

9

First Reading, No Action

Background

In his appearance before the Board of Governors in 1987, Governor George Deukmejian referred to matriculation as ". . . the keystone of community college reform." And, indeed, while the passage of AB 1725 a few months ago has since provided the full blueprint for the future, matriculation, which was adopted in law more than a year earlier in AB 3, remains the central and organizing concept which makes all of the other curricular and instructional reforms of AB 1725 feasible.

Matriculation in the California Community Colleges is a process that promotes and sustains the effort of students to reach their educational goals by providing a program of support services tailored to the needs of individual students.

The responsibility of the college is to provide an admissions process, an orientation to college services and procedures, pre-enrollment assessment and counseling, advisement and counseling for course selection, a suitable curriculum or program of courses, follow-up on student progress with referral to support services when needed, and a program of institutional research and evaluation.

In turn, the student has an obligation to express at least a broad educational intent at entrance and to declare a specific educational objective within a reasonable period of enrollment. The commitment of the college to provide matriculation is based on an assumption that students will be diligent in class attendance, complete assigned coursework, and maintain progress toward an educational goal according to standards set by the college.

Analysis

This agenda item presents preliminary findings from the first phase of the statewide implementation of matriculation. In accordance with the Board of Governors plan for the implementation of matriculation, each college is required to submit an

annual progress report to the Chancellor for approval in relation to the minimum requirements adopted by the Board in January 1987. Reports received by the Chancellor's Office by October 31, 1988 were the first statewide reports on the implementation of the statewide program. Information from the local annual progress reports will be incorporated into the annual report to the Legislature concerning the progress of the implementation of matriculation in meeting the intent and requirements of AB 3, (Chapter 1467, Statutes of 1986). The legislative report, which is due on April 1st, will be presented to the Board of Governors for adoption on March 9-10, 1989.

The purpose of the first annual report on the implementation of matriculation is to assess the progress of colleges toward meeting the objectives identified by each college in its three year plan submitted to the Chancellor's Office in December 1987. The plan for implementation over a three year development period addressed the goals and minimum requirements set by the Board of Governors in its plan for statewide implementation of matriculation. The Board Plan included specific goals related to improving student success and to increasing the effectiveness of the delivery of educational services in the state. While it is too early in the life of the implementation to evaluate its impact on student outcomes or the way the colleges serve students, this preliminary analysis provides helpful information about how the colleges are going about initiating matriculation activities with limited state funding by identifying what the colleges are doing to implement the program and what barriers will have to be overcome during the three year phase-in period. The colleges and the Chancellor's Office will use the analysis from the first year implementation to improve the implementation.

Method for Preliminary Analysis

This report is based on information submitted by sixty colleges reporting within a week and a half of the reporting deadline. Time pressure for completion of the report limited the analysis to a "convenience" sample. Included in the analysis are urban, rural, and suburban colleges as well as small, medium, and large colleges. The range of characteristics among the sixty colleges included in the analysis suggests that the preliminary findings will be predictive of the findings from all the colleges. The final report, which will include all the colleges, will be presented to the Board of Governors in March for adoption.

The information presented in this preliminary report is based on a staff analysis of the Assessment Updates, Executive Summaries and the Cost Summaries from the Progress Reports. The Assessment Updates asked fourteen questions regarding the assessment practices and procedures at the colleges. Included were descriptions of "comprehensive assessment" as implemented; step-by-step description of the assessment process; plans for integration of assessment results with curriculum and course scheduling; student reaction to assessment; assessment effectiveness; problems; tracking (if any); validation studies; basic skills courses established as a

result of assessment information; changes in the delivery system for instruction based on assessment results; extent of staff training in test administration, and uses of test results. The Executive summaries are a narrative account of accomplishments of the colleges during the first year of state funding, barriers encountered in implementing the components of matriculation, and priorities for the 1988-89 academic year. The Cost Summaries present information about expenditures of state and local funds by component. The cost model for matriculation identified Admissions, Orientation, Skills Assessment, Advisement/Counseling, and Student Follow-Up as the major components of matriculation. The reporting of activities and costs for first year activities was based on the structure and expectations identified in the cost model and then further developed and adopted in the Board of Governors Plan for Implementation of matriculation.

In addition, a preliminary analysis done by the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI) is appended to the agenda item (Appendix A). ETI, as the external evaluator of matriculation, will prepare a full evaluation on the implementation at the end of the three year phase-in period. In the interim, ETI will provide annual formative evaluations to improve implementation during the development period. Their annual evaluation of the first funded year will be included with the March agenda item to the Board of Governors.

Recommended Action

No action on this item is anticipated at this time. The Board of Governors will be asked to the adopt a report on the first year implementation of matriculation at its March meeting.

Staff Presentation: *James Meznek, Vice Chancellor*
Educational Policy

Allene Murdoch, Coordinator
Statewide Matriculation Program

Matriculation

A Preliminary Report on First-Year Implementation in the California Community Colleges

January 1989

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Sacramento, California

Contents

Page

Policy Context of Matriculation 1

First Year Implementation 2

Findings from the Progress Reports 4

Admissions Component 4

Exemption Criteria 5

Orientation Component 6

Assessment Component 7

Uses of Assessment Results 8

Counseling Component 8

Student Follow-Up Component 9

Coordination and Training 9

Institutional Research and Evaluation 10

Funding and Expenditures in 1987-88 11

Conclusion 14

Appendices

A. Initial Review of the 1987-88 Matriculation Plan Progress Reports by the Evaluation and Training Institute

B. Student Matriculation: A Plan for Implementation

C. Matriculation Regional Advisory Committee Members

D. Matriculation Evaluation Advisory Council Members

E. Matriculation Assessment Advisory Panel Members

F. Matriculation Data Processing Allocations

Matriculation: Preliminary Report on First-Year Implementation

Policy Context of Matriculation

In the late 1970s, a generalized concern about the effectiveness of community colleges emerged in state public policy circles. The concerns ranged in specificity from research reports documenting a decline in transfers through concerns about too many "avocational and recreational" courses to undocumented allegations of fiscal mismanagement. With the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, state level concern sharpened as the total cost of the California Community Colleges became the fourth largest line item in the California State Budget. While specific targets of criticism varied, criticism was rooted in a generalized concern that the quality of the colleges had slipped and that there was an erosion of the state higher education policy goals assigned to the community colleges.

The manifestation of those concerns was most immediately apparent in the reduced financial circumstances of the colleges. As the post-Proposition 13 mood intensified, funding support for the colleges declined. College constituencies began to acknowledge their own concerns about the colleges and to talk about "reform." In Fall 1982, The Academic Senate for California Community Colleges passed a resolution called "Matriculated Student." It asserted that at least those students with degree or certificate aspirations should be designated as "matriculated" and should be held to certain requirements in order to maintain that status. In the following April, the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges focused on that and two other Senate resolutions as possible keys to resolving concerns about the educational quality of community colleges. He appointed a 24-member Task Force on Academic Quality to review several interrelated issues, including standards of rigor for credit courses applicable to the associate and baccalaureate degrees, the role of community colleges in providing remediation, and model processes to assist students in making appropriate educational choices to reach their stated educational goals. This latter portion of the charge became the matriculation concept. In June 1983, the Board of Governors approved a model for student matriculation.

In the spring of 1983, the Legislature provided the Chancellor's Office with $50,000 in the 1983 Budget Act to pilot test the matriculation model in 16 community colleges around the state. After a year of study and refinement, including six regional public hearings, the Board, in June, 1984 adopted "Student Matriculation: A Plan for Implementation in the California Community Colleges." By that time, the matriculation model was well received by the college constituencies and by the Legislature as well.

During the 1984 legislative session, the Board sponsored a matriculation implementation bill which was carried by Senator John Seymour; another bill

carried by Assemblyman Robert Campbell also supported the implementation of matriculation. It seemed for a time that year that funding was on its way. The Chancellor called on local college districts to develop proposals for local plans consistent with the Board's model. Fifty-two colleges submitted plans in anticipation of funding and twenty were actually selected. But the uncertainty of the state's economic condition and a separate but related legislative call for a year-long study of the community college mission resulted in delaying the decision to fund matriculation. Nevertheless, the enthusiasm of the colleges for matriculation remained high; and in the 1985 Legislative Session, Senator Seymour and Assemblyman Campbell merged their matriculation funding bills into AB 3. Again, colleges geared up with implementation committees and plans, but with the community college mission study underway, the Governor elected to delay the appropriation until the study's completion.

When the Master Plan Commission endorsed the matriculation concept in March 1986, the Board of Governors put its full support behind AB 3. With the support of virtually all the constituent groups in the community colleges, the Seymour-Campbell Matriculation Act (Chapter 1467, Statutes of 1986) was passed in 1986, but lack of funding continued as a barrier to implementation.

In Fall 1986 the Board included a request for matriculation funding in its 1987-88 budget request to the Governor. The Governor's budget included an appropriation of $20.9 million - $13.9 million for one-time information system costs to support student information and follow-up processes to be used over a three year period and $7 million for start-up operations of matriculation services. That recommendation was supported by the Legislature and in January 1988 districts were funded for initial implementation activities. Partial funding of $7 million represented approximately 20 percent of the estimated state share of on-going operational costs.

First Year Implementation

This preliminary report on the first year of implementation of the statewide matriculation program is based on progress reported by the colleges toward full implementation. During that period the colleges were supported by one-time data processing funds and 20 percent of the state support share of operational costs. Progress toward full implementation throughout the three year development period will be measured against the plan set forward in "Student Matriculation: A Plan for Implementation," adopted by the Board of Governors on January 23, 1987 (see Appendix B). The strategy for implementation is based on a number of minimum requirements designed to meet the legislative requirements of AB 3 and recommendations consistent with the conceptual model and research findings. The plan for implementation is consistent with the shared governance structure of the community college system.

Support from the Chancellor's Office during the first year of implementation consisted of a small staff which provided statewide coordination for local implementation and assured that the legal requirements for implementation of AB 3 were satisfied. Three advisory committees were formed to support the state effort and provide linkage to the colleges. Staff of the Chancellor's Office has been very ably supported by members of these advisory committees. The Matriculation Regional Advisory Committee (MRAC) provided direct linkage with the campus coordinators in the ten regions of the state. Members of this committee coordinated technical assistance workshops in their regions and advised the state staff on matters related to putting the components of the program in place. This advisory committee continues to provide an important operational link to the large system of colleges. (The membership of this committee is listed in Appendix C.)

The Matriculation Evaluation Advisory Committee (MEAC) was formed in response to a requirement of AB 3 that "the Chancellor appoint an advisory committee to assist in the development of the evaluation. . . ." (The membership of the committee is listed in Appendix D.) During the past year the committee has guided the work of the Chancellor's Office and the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI), the firm selected to conduct the independent evaluation of matriculation implementation. The committee was directed by the Board's Implementation Plan to utilize the systemwide Management Information System (MIS) to the extent possible as the basis for the statewide evaluation matriculation. Lack of implementation funding for MIS seriously undermined the comprehensive evaluation plan developed by the committee and the consultants. Although ETI developed a comprehensive "Matriculation Evaluation Kit" to serve as a working model for local college evaluation activities, lack of MIS funding precluded the use of the model for state-level evaluation activities.

The long-term statewide evaluation of the matriculation program's effectiveness in improving student outcomes must await the funding and implementation of MIS. In recent months, however, as an interim measure, the Chancellor's Office, ETI, the committee, and professional research associations (NORCAL, SCCCIRA, and CACC Research Commission) have developed a draft evaluation plan that uses existing student demographic information and a limited number of student outcome measures. This evaluation strategy will begin to answer questions concerning program impact on student access and success and will provide a transition to MIS reporting.

A third advisory committee, the Matriculation Assessment Advisory Panel, (MAAP) was also stipulated in AB 3 for the purpose reviewing and making recommendations concerning assessment. (The membership of this committee is listed in Appendix E). The specific tasks of this committee have been to develop standards for evaluating assessment instruments and procedures for matriculation, to draft Title 5 regulatory language that ensures compliance with the legislative intent, and to provide leadership in identifying training needs and successful models for implementation. Draft regulations for matriculation assessment are scheduled for a preliminary review by

the Board of Governors in March 1988. It is not anticipated that additional regulations concerning matriculation will be written until the completion of the three year developmental period.

Findings from the Progress Reports

The preliminary analysis suggests that during the ten-month funding period approximately 40 percent of the community college students who were enrolled in credit courses received core matriculation services. The progress reports show that the colleges are making headway with matriculation, but were impeded in the first year by partial funding and lack of funding for the statewide management information system (MIS). Accomplishments within the components of matriculation exceed what might be expected given the relatively small proportion (20 percent) of the estimated state costs funded in the first year for on-going costs of operations. This may be explained in part by the initiative of many colleges and college districts in implementing matriculation and by the momentum created by a number of related reform activities. In fact, a number of "lighthouse" colleges have served as models to those who are now beginning to implement various components of matriculation with the assistance of additional state dollars. However, activity in the individual components of matriculation shows significantly greater accomplishment in the enrollment stages of the matriculation process, especially admissions and assessment, than in the sustaining stages of counseling and student follow-up. The sections which follow portray, component by component, the extent to which the colleges have implemented matriculation.

Admissions Component

Admissions offices generally initiate the matriculation process. The student's initial educational goal and whether the student will receive additional matriculation services or be exempted from that process are determined by information collected in the admissions office of the college. Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the admissions process so that students are not discouraged from enrolling is one goal of this component. Another goal is to gather student information that improves the college's capacity to match services to student need. Finally, information gathered in the admissions office is key to local and statewide evaluations.

The sample colleges report progress in the start-up year in developing and revising admissions forms to capture matriculation related data. Innovations in easing the complications of registration appear to be another accomplishment in admissions. Accomplishments related to computerization efforts include: on-line student exemption status, modification of equipment for admissions record-keeping, on-line attendance verification, on-line control of enrollment eligibility for registration ("lockout"), matriculation information storage and retrieval, and electronic transcript storage. ETI reports that:

- Forty percent of a sample of 60 colleges reported the development/revision of admissions forms to capture matriculation related data.

- Eleven percent had early registration systems in place including mail-in, drop-off, phone-in, etc.

- Eight percent reported inservice training for admissions staff.

- Twelve percent indicated the identification of exemption criteria or of exempt and non-exempt students.

However, many colleges fell short of their planned goals for implementation of the admissions component in the first year due to the delay in MIS funding and the resulting delay of the completion of the statewide data element dictionary designed to systematize student information reported across all 106 colleges. Only three colleges in the sample reported the design of a student information system and identification of MIS data elements.

Exemption Criteria

Colleges are exempting students from some components of the matriculation process on a number of bases. Prior educational experience and type of courses or unit load are the two most common reasons for exempting students from orientation, assessment, and/or counseling.

The most frequently used criteria related to prior academic experience and/or assessment results are as follows:

- Ninety-two percent of the sample exempt students with an associate degree or higher.

- Thirty-seven percent exempt students with recent scores on test instruments such as ACT, SAT, etc.

- Ten percent exempt students enrolled in a full course of study at another college.

- Seven percent exempt continuing students who are performing successfully and are close to degree completion.

Most frequently cited criteria related to unit load or types of courses were as follows:

- Forty-four percent exempt students enrolling in courses not dependent on skills prerequisites.

- Thirty-six percent exempt students enrolled in courses to upgrade skills or other employment related continuing education.

- Twenty percent exempt students whose goal is "personal growth."

- Nineteen percent exempt students enrolling in six or fewer units.

The Board of Governors Plan for Implementation recommends against the use of numbers of units as an exemption criteria. This recommendation was based on the assumption that many students who enroll initially in one or two courses may especially benefit from the support services of matriculation. As colleges receive more funding for matriculation and are able to serve more students, it is expected that matriculation research findings will show which exemption criteria best achieve the goals of student access and success. This aspect of matriculation will be monitored as the implementation proceeds.

Orientation Component

The Board of Governors plan for implementation sets as a minimum requirement for this component that students will become familiar with the programs, services, academic expectations, procedures and campus facilities. The plan further recommends that orientation begin prior to the beginning of classes and extend beyond the beginning of classes if desired. In addition it was recommended that colleges consider using students to assist in conducting orientation.

The ETI evaluation of the Progress Report Executive Summaries reveals the following orientation activities:

- Twenty-eight percent have developed or produced orientation materials, catalogues, schedules, brochures, etc.

- Twenty-two percent have produced videotapes for orientation.

- Eight percent have initiated early outreach for high school seniors.

Other activities reported include new orientation courses and programs, group orientation sessions, and summer orientation. It is not always clear in the reports from the colleges how many of the activities described by the colleges have been implemented as a result of the matriculation and which are using matriculation as an opportunity to update and review existing procedures.

Assessment Component

By the October 1988 reporting deadline, substantial progress in the implementation of the assessment component was reported by 58 of the 60 colleges in the preliminary analysis. Most colleges were making an effort to provide comprehensive assessment for at least those students who meet registration deadlines. Many colleges were able to extend their efforts to include evening, week-end, and off-campus students as well. Skills competencies are being measured using combinations of standardized test scores, transcript evaluation, counselor or faculty interviews, grade point average information, and student self reports. Systemwide there is a substantial effort at comprehensive assessment which uses multiple criteria for placement.

Methods of assessing students for English language skills are reported as follows:

- Virtually all of the colleges (57) report that they assess students' English language skills.
- Forty-eight percent use an English language test that is part of a larger assessment battery developed by The College Board or American College Testing. Typically, this type of assessment "package" includes a student educational needs survey with a research component for follow-up and local validation studies.
- Seventy-seven percent report using an additional assessment of English language, typically an essay during the first week of class.
- Forty-seven percent report having a formal, separate assessment for ESL.

Mathematics assessment falls into the following pattern:

- Forty-eight percent use the American College Testing and College Board assessment packages which include a math component. Many colleges report supplementing or replacing those instruments with a math assessment developed by the college's mathematics department.
- Of the remaining colleges, thirty-four percent report the use of one math instrument; ten percent use two or more; and twelve percent report using the test developed by the UC/CSU Mathematics Diagnostic Testing Project. These instruments are often combined with other measures such as self reports on highest level of secondary school math completed or recent successful completion of a college math course.

Uses of Assessment Results

Sixty-nine percent of the colleges in the sample report that they require assessment for non-exempt students. Of these, twenty-one percent report using the results of the assessment for mandatory placement. However, the interpretation of "mandatory" varies considerably. Whether a college regards its placement as mandatory or not, most colleges provide appeal or waiver processes for students wishing to enroll directly in courses without assessment. Colleges also report opportunities to retest and/or faculty appeal procedures for students who feel that a particular assessment result does not accurately represent their ability to succeed in a course. To clarify these and other important policy issues, procedures, and criteria, Title 5 regulatory language is being prepared for review through consultation this spring.

As anticipated, the implementation of the assessment component of matriculation has resulted in curriculum development in basic skills. Seventy-eight percent of the colleges report adding new courses to the college curriculum, with an additional three percent planning to add courses. Forty-three percent of the new courses are in mathematics, thirty-six percent in reading, thirty-one percent in writing, twenty-four percent in English as a second language, five percent in speaking, two percent in listening, and two percent in critical thinking. The wide range of new offerings in the basic skills include: computer aided instruction, math labs, basic skills labs, vocational basic skills, study skills, and career guidance.

Counseling Component

The Board plan for matriculation requires two elements in the initial counseling component: the college must provide a process to enable the student to develop an educational plan so that it can update that plan as the student proceeds through the college program. Through the initial counseling component, the college must also provide placement into courses based on the results of comprehensive assessment.

The matriculation cost model anticipated that a major cost for this component would be additional staffing in counseling departments. While it was not assumed that all colleges would adopt a matriculation model based on individual counseling, cost projections for this component were based on a one half hour counseling session for each non-exempt student at first entrance to college and on-going sessions for students who have not decided on educational goals or who are placed on academic probation. The ETI review of the Executive Summaries from the Progress Reports shows the following pattern of counseling activity and suggests that colleges have not made as much progress in this costly service as they have in the less costly components:

- Fourteen percent provide training related to matriculation for counselors, faculty advisors, or student advisors.

- Twelve percent had provided computer terminals for counselors.

- Ten percent of the sample report expanded counseling hours.
- Five percent report review and/or revision of the counseling and advising process and guidelines.
- Five percent reported hiring new counselors.

The preliminary finding that only five percent hired new counselors bears further investigation. One explanation for this relatively small figure is the limitation of partial funding. In addition, the late receipt of funds during the 1987-88 academic year may have caused colleges to defer hiring of additional certificated staff until the level of funding for the 1988-89 year was known. Another possibility is that this information is an artifact of the "open-ended" reporting format of the Progress Report forms. The external evaluator will be asked to follow up on this finding during the phone survey to be conducted in January.

Student Follow-Up Component

The colleges report relatively little new activity in monitoring and supporting student progress during the first year of implementation. A noteworthy exception in this relatively undeveloped component of matriculation is that a significant minority of reporting colleges have developed computerized "early warning" systems for students experiencing academic difficulties, including twelve percent who have computer generated academic status letters which are mailed to students experiencing academic difficulties.

Coordination and Training

The Matriculation Implementation Plan requires that local matriculation practices be coherently implemented and that staff development be conducted in areas critical to success of matriculation efforts.

Limitations in the first year reporting format make drawing conclusions as to the extent of coordination and training at the colleges problematic. However, it is clear that many colleges have begun to implement this aspect of matriculation. ETI analysis of the Executive Summaries reveals the following information:

- Twenty-two percent of the colleges in the sample report that they appointed or hired a Matriculation Coordinator.
- Twenty percent report having held staff development and/or inservice activities.

- Eight percent report having provided faculty inservice related to matriculation.

Staff analysis of the Assessment Updates reveals a much higher percentage of training in test administration and in the uses of test scores. It is unclear why the colleges did not include this training in the Executive Summaries; it may have been because they were not asked specific questions in that section of the report. The Assessment Update instructions asked specifically the number of counselors, instructional faculty, and other staff trained in test administration and uses of test scores. The results appear below:

- Eighty-six percent of the sample colleges report having formally trained counselors.

- Sixty-nine percent of the sample report having formally trained instructional faculty.

- Eighty-one percent report having trained other staff, ranging from administrators to clerical personnel.

Staff will continue to monitor the progress of the colleges in providing faculty/staff training relevant to matriculation, and will make necessary changes in reporting requirements to ensure consistent responses for future analysis.

Institutional Research and Evaluation

The Implementation Plan requires that the colleges participate in the statewide evaluation of matriculation, to occur during the first three and one half years of implementation, and to adopt procedures for evaluating the effect of local matriculation practices.

Neither ETI nor staff analyses reveal significant activity in Research and Evaluation as yet. This is understandable since the colleges do not have complete data processing capacity, the statewide MIS was not funded, and only small numbers of students have moved through the matriculation process.

Many colleges report planning for research and evaluation, however, and preliminary statistics can be expected in future reports. Several colleges have provided anecdotal reports on the impact of matriculation on student persistence and other outcomes. Some of the comments are:

> "... retention rate is thirty-seven percent higher for students who participated in matriculation."

". . . course completion rate is eleven percent higher for students who participated in matriculation."

". . . students who enrolled in and completed an extended orientation course completed more credit units, had a higher GPA, and had a higher rate of persistence than students who did not take such a course."

". . . demand for reading, English, and math increased."

". . . transfer level class skills are more uniform and are rising. . . ."

". . . sixty percent reduction in number of probationary and dismissed students since assessment and advising were phased-in. . . ."

Funding and Expenditures in 1987-88

The receipt of $7 million, or 20 percent, of full state funding for operations caused limitations in the first-year implementation. (Allocations to the colleges for operations and data processing are attached as Appendix F). When the limitations in operational funds were known, colleges were advised to proceed as fully as they could based on local priorities.

To support local operations related to matriculation, the colleges also received a data processing allocation of $13.9 million for computer systems design and development to be used over the three year phase-in of matriculation. These funds were to support the local programs by providing automated assessment test results, additional counselor terminals for access to student education records, automated student follow up activities, and the development of automated individual development plans. This funding was essential to support the infrastructure of the matriculation process as it served increasing proportion of the student population. These funds will be spent over three years. First year expenditures were concentrated in assessment. Subsequent year expenditures will support student counseling and follow up activities.

In contrast to the local focus of the data processing appropriation for matriculation, the state-level Management Information System (MIS), which is as yet unfunded, will support the development of systems for a comprehensive and integrated set of data reporting to the state office, including data on student demographics, student outcomes, assessment results, financial aid, categorical programs, courses, programs, staff, student services, finance, and facilities. The MIS intended to provide the basis for all systemwide state and federal reporting, research, planning, evaluation, and accountability activities. Matriculation data elements are a small but important subset of overall MIS reporting requirements. The funding of MIS in 1988-89, and in subsequent years, is essential to evaluation of the outcomes of matriculation as the program matures.

Expenditures for the 60 colleges in the preliminary study show that local contributions for 1987-88 are greater than the predicted expenditures from the MPR cost model (see Table 1). The $62 million reported as the local contribution exceeds the estimation from the model by approximately eight percent. Estimates of current matriculation-related expenditures at the time of the cost study and projections of the additional needs resulted in a recommendation of the three to one ratio of local to state funding. Further investigation of the reported expenditures will be an important feature of the March report.

Table 1
Matriculation Funding

1987-88

Table 1a
Actual Expenditures Based on 60 Colleges

	Planned*		Allocation		Expenditure		Carryover
	State	Local	State	Local	State	Local	State
Operating Expense	19.2	57.5	3.8	n/a	2.4	62.0	1.4
One-Time DP	7.6	n/a	8.1	n/a	3.2	n/a	4.9
Total	26.8	--	11.9	--	5.6	--	6.3

Table 1b
Projected Expenditures for All Colleges

	Planned*		Allocation		Expenditure		Carryover
	State	Local	State	Local	State	Local	State
Operating Expense	35.0	105.0	7.0	n/a	4.3	109.0	2.7
One-Time DP	13.9	n/a	13.9	n/a	5.2	n/a	8.7
Total	48.9	-	20.9	--	9.5	--	11.4

Source: Matriculation Plan Progress Update (*October 1988*).
Note: All figures are in million dollars.
Not Applicable is denoted by n/a.
* Planned is based on MPR model.

In 1987-88 colleges spent $2.5 million or 64 percent of the $3.9 million allocated for operating expenses. They carried over $1.4 million of the allocations for operations into the 1988-89 academic year for several reasons. First, funds did not actually reach the colleges until Spring 1988 due to the time required for the colleges to

complete plans for the implementation and for the Chancellor's Office to approve the plans. Second, the scaling back of original plans based on assumptions of full funding, caused delays in response time once funds were available.

Analysis of expenditures by component suggests that the model may have under estimated certain matriculation expenditures (see Table 2). Preliminary indications are that colleges are spending significantly more local funds than was projected for counseling and admissions for matriculation-related costs. Actual counseling expenses surpass the projected figure by 18.8 percent; admissions expenditures are seven percent greater than anticipated. An alternative explanation for deviations from the model is that start-up activities in implementation create disturbances in normal patterns of activities and expenditures. With full funding and more time spent in implementation, it is expected that components such as Follow-up will increase their share of total expenditures. Analysis of progress reports from all the colleges, the phone survey of matriculation coordinators on the campuses by ETI, and analysis of the progress reports for the second year of implementation should clarify inconsistencies with the model.

Table 2

Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges
Matriculation Funding
1987-88

	Total Matriculation Expenditure		
	Planned*	Actual**	Difference
Admission/Registration	22.5%	29.5	+7.0
Data Processing (ongoing)	16.8	9.7	-7.1
Research/Evaluation	2.3	1.2	-1.1
Orientation	2.0	6.8	+4.8
Assessment	1.8	7.0	+5.2
Advise/Counsel/SEP	13.4	32.2	+18.8
Follow-Up	38.1	10.2	-27.9
Administration	3	2.8	-0.2
Training Activities	0	0.6	+0.6

Source: Matriculation Plan Progress Update (*October 1988*).
* Based on MPR model, with cost adjusted to 1984-85 figures.
** $64.49M based on 60 colleges.

Conclusion

Given the enormity and complexity of the matriculation undertaking and the limitations of first year funding, the community college system is progressing well in the implementation of matriculation. Substantial progress appears to have been made in the implementation of the admissions, orientation, and assessment components of the matriculation process. Partial funding for operations, lack of funding for MIS, and delay in the actual receipt of funds during the first year were limitations during the start-up year. Those limitations have been mitigated to some extent in the second year.

If the analysis of the 47 remaining progress reports supports the preliminary findings, technical assistance for the rest of 1988-89 will focus on supporting the less fully developed components of counseling, student follow-up, and research and the integration of these components with assessment and course standards. Funding and sufficient time to address these components will facilitate their development and are essential for full implementation of matriculation.

APPENDIX A

THE STATEWIDE EVALUATION OF MATRICULATION

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE 1987-88 MATRICULATION PLAN PROGRESS REPORTS

SUBMITTED BY

THE EVALUATION AND TRAINING INSTITUTE

DECEMBER 5, 1988

ETI AND THE STATEWIDE EVALUATION OF MATRICULATION

The Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI) is a non-profit corporation which has conducted numerous educational program evaluations at the national, state and local level, including 15 state level projects for the Chancellor's Office and numerous studies for local districts and colleges in California. In August, 1987, ETI was selected through a competitive bid process to develop a design for a statewide evaluation of the implementation of the matriculation program in the California community colleges.

During the 1987-88 program year, ETI worked with State Chancellor's Office staff and local districts in defining the research questions to be addressed in the evaluation of matriculation and the methodologies to be used. As one component of a formative evaluation, ETI proposed to review the progress reports submitted by local colleges to determine how the colleges were progressing in the implementation of the program. During the first phase of this review, ETI staff did a content analysis of the narrative portions of the progress reports in which colleges reported their accomplishments for 1987-88 as well as the barriers they encountered in program implementation. The findings of this preliminary review are summarized below.

ETI staff are now in the process of doing a more detailed review in which the progress reports are being compared to the colleges' original plans for the implementation of each of the seven components of the matriculation program. In addition to this indepth review, ETI staff will conduct a telephone survey of the matriculation coordinators at all colleges to collect additional information on matriculation activities at the local level. This survey will be followed by site visits to a selected sample of 15 colleges and surveys of students. A detailed cost analysis of the program will also be conducted by the Associates for Education Finance and Planning. The outcomes of all research activities will be summarized in the first annual evaluation report on matriculation which will be submitted to the State Chancellor's Office in March and to the State Legislature in April.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS OF THE REVIEW OF COLLEGE PROGRESS REPORTS

A total of 60 colleges' progress reports were provided to ETI staff by the State Chancellor's Office. The major findings emerging from the preliminary review are summarized below:

- **Reductions and delays in funding impeded the colleges' implementation of matriculation in 1987-88.**

Seventy percent of the colleges included in the review were behind schedule in implementing their local plan for matriculation, or had to scale back their local plans. The most frequently reported barriers colleges encountered in program implementation were related to cutbacks or delays in funding (See Table 1 attached).

- **Over one-third of the colleges reported that the implementation of matriculation was also hampered by limited computer resources at the local level.**

Limitations in both hardware and software were reported. Over seventy percent of the colleges which identified computer resource problems had carried over their one-time data

processing allocations, and we would anticipate that these funds would be used to remedy MIS deficiencies in future years. Those colleges which specifically reported they had begun systems development or conversion during 1987-88 frequently noted, however, that the process was taking longer than anticipated.

- **The postponement of the implementation of the Statewide MIS also slowed local colleges' execution of their matriculation plans and the development of local management information systems.**

The elimination of funding for the statewide MIS led many colleges to put local systems development "on hold" until they receive definitive statements of state level reporting requirements for matriculation. Additionally, some colleges reported delaying the modification of admissions forms until they receive a final statement on state level reporting requirements.

- **The most frequently reported matriculation activities completed by the colleges for matriculation in 1987-88 included: 1) The development or revision of admissions forms to capture the data elements necessary for matriculation (40% of reporting colleges); 2) the development and production of orientation materials (28%); 3) the identification or development of assessment instruments (25%); and 4) the identification or employment of a Matriculation Coordinator or Dean (22%).**

- **The most frequently reported data processing activities related to matriculation completed in 1987-88 included: 1) The implementation of a computerized storage and retrieval system for assessment outcomes (22%); 2) the development of computerized early warning systems for students with academic difficulties (15%); and 3) the provision of computer terminals to counselors (12%).**

Tables 2 through 8 present the activities completed for each component of matriculation as reported by the colleges. The pattern of activities suggests that most colleges focused on start-up activities for the admissions, orientation and assessment components of the program, with assessment receiving the primary emphasis. The specific nature of the activities reported also indicates that most colleges were undertaking new tasks in implementing matriculation, as opposed to expanding or augmenting existing services.

- **Colleges have proposed an extensive array of criteria for exempting students from the matriculation process. The majority of these criteria are related to: 1) the unit load or type of course in which the student is enrolling; or 2) the prior academic experience or assessment outcomes of the student.**

Table 9 presents a complete listing of the criteria colleges have proposed to use for exemption. One interesting distinction is that over one-third of the colleges have proposed to exempt students taking courses to improve or augment their job skills.

- **Given that 1987-88 was a start-up year, colleges were not able to report program outcomes. However, a few colleges identified some immediate impacts of the program, all of which were positive in nature.**

The sample comments of reporting colleges regarding their accomplishments for 1987-88 provides a sense of the initial effects of matriculation. Most prominent is the impact matriculation is having upon communication and coordination among student services staff, faculty and the campus administration. Additionally, two colleges indicated that their assessment programs had not decreased their enrollments, as some college staff had feared.

ETI will be conducting a system wide telephone survey of all Matriculation Coordinators in January. This survey will provide additional information on the current status of matriculation, including staffing, local MIS plans, program plans, and other issues.

BARRIERS TO IMPLEMENTATION: SAMPLE COMMENTS

"Our three-year plan, based on the assumption of 100% funding, was ambitious in and of itself. To be given only 40% funding and then to be expected to demonstrate the effectiveness of the program to the Legislature is a prescription for failure."

"Funding was less than 20% of the expected level, and it arrived in March, 1988--well past the time to have major impact on 1987-88."

"The most severe obstacle to implementation has been the lack of direction at the State level. The College did not receive official notice that our plan was approved until late Spring."

"Many of the details necessary to alter existing systems proved to be complex logistically and politically and plans needed massaging and marketing."

"A new and larger computer is being installed with full implementation targeted for August, 1989. This project, requiring significant effort of many college staff members, is diverting considerable attention away from implementation of matriculation."

"The long, often postponed release of the promised revised MIS Data Element Dictionary wrecked (sic) havoc with the development of student data collection instruments and needed enhancements to current and new Student Information System (SIS) software."

"Current hardware and software systems were inadequate for automated entry and retrieval of matriculation data."

"Efforts involving placement testing and course prerequisites have been delayed because of the State-level uncertainties concerning the utilization of test results for mandatory placement, as well as the lack of definitive information on test standardization, reliability, and validity."

TABLE 1. BARRIERS TO PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION REPORTED BY COLLEGES

	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
FUNDING-RELATED ISSUES	
Limited amount of funding	47%
Inadequate level of staff related funding cutbacks or delays	45
Delays in receipt of funds	25
Inadequate facilities to house additional staff or activities	20
Lack of trained staff	18
Skepticism regarding future funding	17
MIS/DATA PROCESSING ISSUES	
Limitations of existing computer systems	37
Incomplete status of statewide MIS	28
Time required for local system development/conversion	17
MIS/DP staffing problems	8
Lack of support from district data services	5
MANAGEMENT/ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES	
Limited direction/coordination of the program by the State Chancellor's Office	10
Delays in plan approval by the State Chancellor's Office	8
Inadequate communication among different campus functions/units at the college	8
Cumbersome reporting/evaluation/accounting requirements	8
Changes in campus administration/personnel	5
ASSESSMENT ISSUES	
Inadequate assessment procedures	8
Lack of clarity at the state level regarding placement/assessment procedures	5
Lack of research and awareness of the value of assessment	3
OTHER ISSUES	
Lack of interest in matriculation among faculty/staff	8
Lack of understanding of matriculation	5
Fear that matriculation will result in loss of enrollments	5
Misunderstanding regarding faculty/advisor roles	5
Inability to provide sufficient number of basic skills classes	2

ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND COMPLETED ACTIVITIES
1987-88

REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: SAMPLE COMMENTS

"The fear that implementing Matriculation would lose enrollments was not true. Our enrollments are up at least 4 % and we have 1000+ new full-time students."

"Over 1,800 students matriculated successfully during 1987-88."

"Over 50,000 eligibility messages were sent to students prior to fall 1987 registration. Tracking records show that 3,878 new students participated in orientation prior to registration and that another 966 enrolled in guidance classes. The Assessment Center administered 31,381 tests during 1987-88 to 19,476 students. A total of 57,906 service transactions were recorded."

"Augmented counseling hours tripled the appointments available to evening and week-end students. Testing at high school campuses produced a 95% registration rate among participants."

"Approximately 1,000 more new students were seen prior to the first day of registration than in previous years."

"We began to define matriculation in a way that was different from what we had seen before. Earlier it had been seen as narrow in scope; now we were defining it more broadly and seeing it as positively affecting more students in a variety of ways. Specifically, we were learning through the process of planning that there was more to matriculation than assessment and placement. Through the planning process, we were learning about communication and cooperation with areas of the college that had not had the occasion to work together on a common project before."

"The most important initial challenge . . . in developing and implementing matriculation has been fulfilled. That challenge was capturing the resources and obtaining the cooperation of the multiple number of people of the college."

REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: SAMPLE COMMENTS

"The . . . matriculation plan was a major accomplishment during the 1987-88 year. The plan was the result of many hours of committee work, attendance at regional workshops, pilot testing of the assessment instruments, and hours of writing."

" . . . the philosophies on which matriculation have been built are embraced by the faculty and staff at this institution."

"Ultimately, the faculty voted on the plan and affirmed its goals and activities. Very few, if any, community colleges utilized a faculty polling process to approve the matriculation plan. While this did delay the submission of the plan past the required deadline, the acceptance by the faculty was viewed as a critical factor in ensuring the success of matriculation."

TABLE 2. REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: ADMISSION ACTIVITIES COMPLETED IN 1987/88

Process-Related Activities	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
Admission form developed/revised to capture data elements necessary for matriculation	40%
Early registration system instituted, with mail-in enrollment and drop-off boxes	8
Admissions staff provided in-service training on matriculation	8
Exempt and non-exempt students identified	7
Exemption criteria identified	5
Recruitment activities expanded, with high school senior days, community outreach, etc.	3
Touch-tone telephone registration developed	3
Additional admissions clerks hired	3
Special program implemented to allow high school students to apply/register on local high school campuses	
Electronic on-line telephone answering system installed	
Microfiche reader purchased	2
DP/MIS-Related Activities	
Student information system (SIS) designed, and MIS data elements identified	5
Computer program developed to automatically determine exemption status of students	3
DP equipment modified for admissions/records purposes	2
Computerized attendance verification process developed	2
Computerized control of enrollment eligibility for registration instituted	2
Computer programs designed to facilitate storage and retrieval of matriculation information	2
Computerized electronic transcript program developed	2

TABLE 3. REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: ORIENTATION ACTIVITIES COMPLETED IN 1987/88

Activities	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
Orientation materials developed/produced (including student handbooks, packets, etc.)	28%
Orientation video produced	22
One-day orientation program held for students	8
Orientation class implemented	8
Early outreach program developed for high school seniors	8
Written information on matriculation published in college catalogue, class schedule, and brochures	8
Matriculation information materials prepared	7
Summer orientation program developed	5
Pilot orientations conducted	3
College orientation program updated	3
Group orientations implemented	3
Guidance curriculum reviewed	2
Counselor orientation reviewed	2
All new students mailed orientation information	2
Additions made to the College Career Library	2
New referral and support services brochure developed	2

TABLE 4. REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: SKILLS ASSESSMENT AND STUDENT EVALUATION ACTIVITIES COMPLETED IN 1987/88

Process-Related Activities	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
Standardized instruments identified/developed for assessment	25%
Assessment services made available to high schools and at off-campus centers	12
Validity and reliability studies of assessment instruments conducted	8
Number of assessment staff increased	5
High school transcripts received from new students	5
Committee for assessment review established	3
Study skills survey administered	3
Matriculation funds supported academic departments in developing reliable, valid, and fair assessment instruments	3
Testing appeal process implemented	2
Testing information more widely disseminated	2
Pilot assessments conducted	2
Form to identify students for specialized support services developed with needs assessment questions	2
Assessment policy formulated	2
Students previous assessment scores collected	2
DP/MIS-Related Activities	
Computerized system for storage and retrieval of assessment results implemented	22
Placement test information printed on instructor roll sheets	2
Computerized assessment instruments purchased	2

TABLE 5. REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: ADVISEMENT/COUNSELING AND COURSE SELECTION ACTIVITIES COMPLETED IN 1987/88

Process-Related Activities	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
More counseling hours provided	10%
Cadre of faculty advisors trained	7
First phase of "Individual Educational Plan" developed	7
Counseling process and guidelines for advising students reviewed/revised	5
In-service held for counselors	5
New counselors hired	5
College survival skills course re-introduced in the curriculum	3
Students needing to file an educational plan identified	3
Student advisors trained	2
"Advising Month" established and promoted campus-wide	2
DP/MIS-Related Activities	
Computer terminals provided to counselors	12
Computerized educational plan developed	8
Educational plan, major, and transfer plan data elements collected at both Fall and Spring registration	2

TABLE 6. REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND EVALUATION ACTIVITIES COMPLETED IN 1987/88

Activities	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
Evaluation plan formulated and approved	7%
Preliminary research reports compiled	3
List of students by exemption status analyzed	2
Evaluation model developed	2
Research package purchased that coordinates with the assessment instruments	2
Indicators for evaluating effectiveness identified and studies undertaken	2
Funds received to design a study to measure and evaluate the effectiveness of student utilization of support services	2
Pilot study on retention undertaken	2

TABLE 7. REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: STUDENT FOLLOW-UP ACTIVITIES COMPLETED IN 1987/88

Process-Related Activities	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
Follow-up activities targeted to undeclared students, students in pre-collegiate basic skills, and special needs students	5%
Classroom presentations/workshops on follow-up activities held	3
College probation/dismissal policy reviewed	2
Student progress evaluation programs developed	2
Counseling plan developed for follow-up of students in academic difficulty	2
Probationary students required to see a counselor prior to registration	2
DP/MIS-Related Activities	
Computerized "early warning" system developed for students with academic difficulties	15
Computerized academic status letters mailed to students with difficulties	12
Computerized letters sent to students who applied but did not register	3

TABLE 8. REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS: COORDINATION AND TRAINING ACTIVITIES COMPLETED IN 1987/88

Activity	Percentage of Colleges Reporting
Matriculation Coordinator/Dean hired or identified	22%
In-service and other staff development activities held	20
Matriculation Steering Committees established	20
Faculty workshops held on the matriculation process	8
Staff matriculation handbook developed	5
Meetings held with department representatives and key administrative groups to review matriculation activities/plans	5
Staff sent to off-campus matriculation workshops and conferences	5
Matriculation Committee expanded/restructured	5
Improvement of Instruction workshops held for faculty	2
Matriculation letter sent to all college employees	2
Matriculation Coordinator attended student service managers meetings	2

TABLE 9. EXEMPTION CRITERIA PROPOSED BY COLLEGES

Criteria Related to Prior Academic Experience/Assessment Results	Percentage of Colleges Using
Students who have completed an associate degree of higher.	92%
Students who have recent scores from SAT, ACT, SCAT, CGP, ASSET or comparable placement tests.	37
Students with previous English or math coursework	15
Students enrolled in a full course of study at another institution.	10
Continuing students who are performing successfully and are nearing completion of degree.	7
Continuing or returning transfer students to this institution.	5
Students transferring from other postsecondary instituions with credit for freshman composition and college algebra.	5
Students who have attended a postsecondary institutions and have received counseling regarding educational goals.	4
Students undergoing extensive testing through the Learning Assistance Program.	2
Students who have taken more than 15 semester or 22 quarter units.	1
Students who have not accumulated 10 units.	1
Students who have completed 30 or more units at the college.	1
Students who have earned 12 or less cumulative units in mixed pattern.	1
Continuing students who have completed 45 units and have a defined major and minimum GPA of 2.0	1

Criteria Related to Unit Load or Type of Course/Program	Percentage of Colleges Using
Students taking courses not dependent on skills pre-requisites.	44%
Students taking courses to upgrade occupational skills or as continuing education related to the student's employment.	36
Students whose educational goal is "personal growth", and who seek to enroll in, and only in, courses related to "personal growth".	20
Students enrolling in six or fewer units.	19
Students enrolling in contract instruction.	19
Students who enroll in and only in non-credit classes.	18
Students participating in a state or federally sponsored apprenticeship program.	14
Students who wish to take only performance or activity courses.	13
Students enrolling in institutes/workshops.	7
Students planing to enroll only in evening classes.	5
Students enrolling only in summer session.	3
Students enrolling only in mini-courses.	3
Students enrolling as special high school student admission.	3
Students enrolled in only one course.	2
Students in the Police Academy	2
Students taking Community Services courses offered for ADA.	2

APPENDIX B

Student Matriculation:

A Plan for Implementation

Adopted by the Board of Governors
of the California Community Colleges
January 23, 1987

Chancellor's Office
Division of Student Services
and Special Programs

Introduction

This plan recognizes that the systemwide matriculation program is a combined effort of the Board of Governors and the local community college districts. Under this model, districts will be accountable for meeting minimum standards adopted by the Board of Governors and for meeting their local plan objectives. Such plans will include a commitment from each district to provide full matriculation services to all students not otherwise exempted within three years, subject, of course, to the adequacy of funding.

This update continues the policies governing matriculation, which the Board of Governors adopted in 1984 in its document, *Student Matriculation: A Plan for Implementation in the California Community Colleges*, and conforms to applicable provisions of AB 3, signed by the Governor on September 30, 1986. However, this draft updates the 1984 Plan by:

a. Eliminating the 1984 proposal to phase-in matriculation over four years on a college to college basis, by replacing it with a systemwide start-up in July 1987 (if funds are available), and phasing in matriculation within the colleges over a three-year period.

b. Reformatting the 1984 Plan's discussion of matriculation components by restating the content in the form of minimum requirements and recommendations for each component and, in some cases, simplifying component labels.

c. Restating the 1984 Plan's discussion of the purposes of matriculation by incorporating language responsive to the Board's statement on the enrollment of minorities, and by stating the overall goals of matriculation as derived from related discussions in the 1984 Plan.

d. Including a discussion of the basic roles of local districts and the Chancellor's Office when implementing matriculation in the first three and a half years.

These revisions were made to bring the 1984 Plan up to date and to respond to concerns that the matriculation plan be explicit about the objectives to be achieved, and the accountability expected.

Board's Statement of Philosophy on Matriculation

California community colleges are committed to serving adults of all ages who can profit from instruction, and they have a special responsibility to ensure equal access to postsecondary education. Colleges provide transfer education, employment preparation instruction, continuing and community education and community services,

as well as student support services to enable students to participate successfully in the programs of the colleges.

In carrying out these functions and responsibilities, the community colleges have an obligation to assist students in attaining their educational goals by providing information and guidance concerning the choices that are available to them. Students, in turn, have a responsibility to pursue their goals with respect for college standards and a sense of accountability in the use of public funds.

Definition of Matriculation

Matriculation is a process which brings a college and a student who enrolls for credit into an agreement for the purpose of realizing the student's educational objective. The agreement acknowledges responsibilities of both parties to attain those objectives through the college's established programs, policies and requirements. On the college's part, the agreement includes providing an admission process; an orientation to college programs, services and procedures; pre-enrollment assessment and counseling; advisement and counseling for course selection; a suitable curriculum or program of courses; continuous follow-up on student progress with referral to support services when needed; and a program of institutional research and evaluation. On the student's part, the agreement includes expression of at least a broad educational intent at entrance and willingness to declare a specific educational objective within a reasonable period of enrollment, diligence in class attendance and completion of assigned coursework, and completion of course and maintenance of progress toward an educational goal according to standards established by the college and the State of California.

Purposes and Goals of Matriculation

The purpose of matriculation is to ensure access to appropriate programs and courses offered by community colleges to all students who can benefit, and to facilitate successful completion of student educational objectives in accordance with applicable standards of educational quality as determined by the Board of Governors and local trustees.

The goals of matriculation include, but are not limited to, the following primary and subsidiary goals:

1. *Student Success.* To increase the extent to which students attain their educational objectives by:

    a. Enabling them to make wise educational choices concerning the programs and courses to pursue based upon clear and sensitive appraisals of their

skills, interests, and aptitudes in relation to the programs and courses offered.

b. Enabling students to complete the units they attempt with satisfactory grades and to persist from term to term.

c. Identifying the support services that students need to succeed (such as financial aid or child care), and by assisting students to meet those needs.

d. Strengthening student motivation to succeed through the above and by providing more frequent performance feedback and encouragement.

2. *Institutional Effectiveness.* To increase the efficacy with which colleges and districts deliver their educational programs and services by:

a. Enabling them to further strengthen partnerships among instructional, service, and administrative staff based upon restructuring of roles and responsibilities as locally determined to be necessary for implementing matriculation.

b. Enabling them to increase collection and utilization of student, curriculum, and services information for purposes of systematic planning, monitoring and evaluation.

c. Increasing local and systemwide accountability by clarifying student and institutional responsibilities and by establishing performance measurements that are appropriate to both.

d. Increasing efficient use of district resources by improved student retention, and better workload planning and delivery of programs and services.

e. Incorporating into local matriculation plans special emphasis on increasing the participation of students who are underrepresented in specific vocational and transfer programs.

Matriculation Components to be Offered

Districts and colleges will implement matriculation so as to achieve, at minimum, the requirements of this section. Recommendations offered to districts should be considered when defining specific institutional practices.

1. Admissions Component

   a. Minimum Requirements

      1) The admissions component will assure that information about new students is obtained, stored, and capable of being utilized to assist the individual student, the institution, and the Chancellor's Office in fulfilling the purpose, goals, and accountability expectations of this plan.

      2) Exemption of students from participating in the orientation, assessment, and/or counseling and advisement components of this plan will be determined by local boards of trustees, and the criteria utilized will be reported to the Chancellor together with the number of students so exempted for statewide evaluation purposes.

   b. Recommendations

      1) That districts/colleges utilize the application for admission as a source of student data for meeting local and statewide data requirements.

      2) That data collected during the application process include information for determining a student's exemption status, for determining whether alternate or additional assessment will be needed, for screening student goals, for discovering extra curricular interests, and for obtaining transcripts of prior work according to locally determined policies.

      3) That districts/colleges encourage early application by students.

      4) That at minimum districts/colleges consider exempting from participation in orientation, assessment, and counseling and advisement components, students who: have completed an associate degree or higher; provide scores from recently taken skills tests which are comparable to those used by the college; seek to enroll only in courses not dependent on skill prerequisites (such as some performing arts or physical fitness courses).

      5) That districts/colleges permit otherwise exempted students who wish to participate in orientation, assessment, and/or counseling and advisement components to be served.

      6) That districts not generally exempt students who: enroll only in evening classes; enroll in fewer than some number of units; do not

wish to participate; are undecided about objectives; and do not intend to earn a degree or certificate.

2. Orientation Component

   a. Minimum Requirements

      1) The orientation component will assure that all new (non-exempt) students will be acquainted with the college's programs, services, academic expectations, procedures, and campus grounds.

      2) The orientation process should be available to students on a timely basis.

   b. Recommendations

      1) That the orientation process begin prior to the time a student begins classes, and may extend beyond the beginning of classes.

      2) That districts/colleges consider utilizing workstudy and/or other student employees to assist in orientation programs.

      3) That districts/colleges consider utilizing student body organizations to also assist in conducting orientation programs.

3. Skills Assessment and Student Evaluation Component

   a. Minimum Requirements

      1) New (non-exempt) students enrolling into credit courses will be assessed for competencies in language and computational skills; assisted in identifying aptitudes, interests, and educational goals; evaluated for learning and study skills; and referred to specialized support services, and/or to supplemental assessments as determined by the college.

      2) Districts/colleges are expected to participate with the Chancellor's Office in an evaluation of assessment practices and instruments to ensure these are valid, reliable, sensitive to cultural and/or linguistic differences among students, and that assessment information is used for advisement, counseling, student follow-up, research, and accountability purposes. In order to conduct evaluation of tests utilized by districts/colleges in meeting the requirements of applicable law and of the plan, the Chancellor will invoke Education Code Section 78213(a), under which he may waive

his authority to authorize the use of specific tests by districts/colleges for the purpose of evaluating such tests. Test authorization will be waived on a year-to-year basis until evaluations of test use are completed. Thereafter, the Chancellor will authorize locally-used tests.

b. Recommendations

1) That districts/colleges collect assessment results in such a way they can be entered into a computerized student information system.

2) That district/colleges develop local policies governing access to computerized student information to ensure student confidentiality is appropriately maintained while permitting access to selected student information for authorized users.

4. Advisement and Counseling and Course Selection Component

a. Minimum Requirements

1) The advisement and counseling and course selection component will provide for a process that enables a student educational plan to be completed for each new non-exempt student, and for such plans to be updated when of benefit to the student.

The student educational plan shall identify the student's educational objectives and the courses, services, and programs to be used to achieve them.

2) When placing students into courses, colleges will utilize the results of the comprehensive assessment, combined with appropriate counseling and advisement, and will provide the programs and services deemed appropriate for student success in accordance with applicable local and statewide policies.

b. Recommendations

1) That districts/colleges develop models to utilize counselors, faculty members, and paraprofessionals to provide appropriate counseling and advisement, consistent with applicable regulations.

2) That districts/colleges, where applicable, substitute student plans developed pursuant to EOPS and/or DSPS requirements for the Student Educational Plan expected of this component.

5. Student Follow-up Component

a. Minimum Requirement

The student follow-up component will assure that the academic progress of each student is regularly followed and that special efforts will be made to regularly assist students who have not declared an educational goal or objective, who are enrolled in pre-collegiate basic skills courses, and/or who have been placed on probation.

b. Recommendations

1) That districts/colleges provide appropriate counseling/advisement at least once each term to students not having clear goals, who are on probation, and/or who are enrolled in pre-collegiate basic skills courses.

2) That districts/colleges utilize computerized information systems to accomplish regular follow-up, to detect early signs of academic difficulty, to communicate more frequently with all students concerning their progress, and to identify students having transfer or vocational potential for the purpose of providing specialized services or encouragement.

6. Institutional Research and Evaluation Component

a. Minimum Requirements

1) Institutions will adopt means for evaluating the effect of local matriculation practices in achieving their local and statewide purposes and objectives, including the impact of matriculation components on other college programs and services.

2) Districts/colleges will participate in a statewide evaluation of matriculation during the first three and a half years of imple mentation. Information requirements for matriculation will be derived, to the greatest extent possible, from the Management Information System.

b. Recommendation

That districts/colleges utilize data gathered from the various components of matriculation to develop an integrated, computerized data base that is

useful for longitudinal research, planning, and evaluation of student outcomes and institutional programs and services.

7. Coordination and Training Component

   a. Minimum Requirement

      That local matriculation practices will be coherently implemented and that colleges will conduct staff development activities they deem critical for matriculation to succeed.

   b. Recommendations

      1) That districts/colleges assign coordination responsibility to a single position having a span of authority sufficient to encompass all six matriculation activities, particularly during the initial phase-in stages of implementation.

      2) That districts/colleges participate in activities sponsored by the Chancellor's Office to enhance the implementation of matriculation.

Role of Districts and Colleges

1. General Responsibilities

   Districts are responsible to the Board of Governors as well as to local constituents for adherence to applicable policies governing matriculation when holding colleges within district jurisdiction accountable to these policies. Colleges are responsible for direct implementation of matriculation in accordance with locally prepared plans approved by local trustees and by the Chancellor.

2. Local Matriculation Plans

   Districts will submit to the Chancellor's Office for each college within its jurisdiction a three year matriculation plan, will implement matriculation in accordance with the plan, and will submit annual progress reports to the Chancellor. Local college plans will be reviewed by the Chancellor for approval in relation to the minimum requirements of this plan. The Chancellor will also review college plans in relation to:

   a. The goals of the local matriculation program and how they respond to the Board's goals for matriculation (as defined on pages 2 and 3).

b. The objectives to be attained by the matriculation program and by each of its components in each of the three years.

c. The activities to be undertaken, and the resources allocated to achieve the activities.

d. Applicable enrollment and services data.

e. The evaluation plan.

The three year plan will cover the 1987 fiscal year through fiscal year 1989, and will be due on or before May 15, 1987. Colleges will prepare matriculation plans using formats designed by the Chancellor's Office. All colleges, when preparing three year plans, are expected to include objectives that would achieve full implementation of matriculation in the 1989-90 academic year.

Role of Board of Governors and the Chancellor's Office

1. Board of Governors

The Board is responsible to the Legislature for adopting policies which meet the requirements of applicable law and legislative intent concerning the implementation of matriculation in the California Community Colleges. This responsibility includes reviewing annual progress reports on matriculation, and adopting new or revised policies as may be appropriate for the successful implementation of matriculation.

2. Chancellor's Office

The Chancellor is responsible to the Board for administering matriculation policies as adopted by the Board, and for directing staff as may be appropriate when carrying out the supportive, allocation, accountability, and evaluation functions noted below.

a. Statewide Support and Assistance

1) Consultation

The Chancellor's consultation process will be utilized to effectively communicate policy and administrative matters among 70 districts and 106 colleges, and shall utilize the consultation process to implement matriculation, to obtain comments and recommendations from districts and colleges affecting matriculation and related matters during implementation. In addition, the Chancellor

will utilize the consultation process for developing policies prior to Board consideration.

2) Training

The Chancellor will work with districts, colleges, and voluntary groups to identify areas of training and staff development necessary for implementing matriculation effectively, and will work with districts, colleges, and voluntary groups in providing the training necessary.

3) Program Development

The Chancellor will work with districts and colleges during the implementation process to identify and develop program improvements, and to monitor the impact of matriculation on student access and success. In particular, the Chancellor will work with districts and colleges to ensure that assessments are appropriate and effective. The Chancellor will take corrective action, as appropriate, if it is reasonably demonstrated that matriculation is not achieving its purposes of ensuring student access and student success.

b. Allocations and Expenditures

1) Allocations

In each fiscal year the Board of Governors will request an appropriation adequate to fund the succeeding year's costs of implementing matriculation at the local and systemwide levels, utilizing data submitted by districts and colleges and costing procedures developed by MPR Associates of Berkeley.

Once the state appropriates the resources to be made available for implementing matriculation, the Board of Governors authorizes the Chancellor to allocate these resources utilizing principles developed by MPR Associates, making adjustments the Chancellor deems appropriate. When determining that adjustments should be made, the Chancellor will utilize the consultation process.

Allocations to districts and colleges will be of two kinds: one-time costs for data processing; and the annual costs of on-going operations. In making allocations, the Chancellor shall not reward districts/colleges which have made no progress, nor penalize districts/colleges which have proceeded.

Data processing allocations will be based upon the following formula: $30,000 + $6.30 x Weighted Credit Enrollment per college. The resulting amount is the sum for which colleges are eligible in meeting the one-time data processing requirements of implementing local matriculation plans. College by college allocations for data-processing may be added together in multi-college districts where college data processing support for matriculation is dependent on coordination through district-wide data processing systems.

The Chancellor may set aside a portion of the total data processing appropriation, not to exceed 1.5% of the data processing amount, for the purpose of developing joint projects between the Chancellor's Office and districts. The function of the joint projects will be to economize and/or coordinate areas of data processing support for local matriculation implementation. In determining the nature of specific joint projects, the Chancellor will utilize the consultation process.

Operating cost allocations will be based upon the following formula: Weighted Enrollment x $11.95, where the weighted enrollment equals 2 x No. of New Students + the No. of Continuing Students + .4 x the No. of Enrollments in Pre-Collegiate Basic Skills courses.

Statewide, colleges are expected to meet 75% of the full estimated cost of matriculation, and the state is expected to meet 25% of the full estimated cost of matriculation. The Chancellor is authorized to adjust local and state contribution expectations to meeting matriculation costs in the event resources at the state or local level are inadequate, or in the event cost estimates change due to enrollment or price shifts.

2) Disbursements

Districts will receive state matriculation allocations through the apportionment procedures and will be expected to keep matriculation expenditure accounts that enable identification of all matriculation expenditures.

c. Accountability

The Chancellor will approve local matriculation plans to ensure compliance with minimum requirements and may, upon review of the plan, recommend changes as may be appropriate to strengthen the effectiveness of such plans or to enable them to achieve policy compliance. The Chancellor will further establish and conduct, as appropriate, on-site

program reviews and/or audits to ensure that local operations conform to plans, and may approve changes to local plans or offer recommendations designed to improve local operations.

d. Evaluation

A draft RFP for the evaluation of matriculation covering a three year period will be submitted to the Department of Finance together with the final version of this plan. Districts will be expected to collect data in accordance with the research requirements beginning in the spring of 1988. The research design will attempt to specify matriculation outcomes for each of the matriculation components and for matriculation as a whole. The evaluation design will also include provisions for assessing the effectiveness with which districts, colleges, and the Chancellor's Office performed their respective implementation roles.

Appendix
Members of Task Group on Preparing Statewide Implementation Plan for Matriculation

Alfred P. Fernandez
Chancellor
Ventura Community College District
71 Day Road
Ventura, CA 93003

Del Anderson
Vice President
Skyline College
3300 College Drive
San Bruno, CA 94066

Richard D. Yeo
Executive Dean
Chabot College
Hayward Campus
25555 Hesperian Boulevard
Hayward, CA 94545

Ron Haynes
Department Chair, Counseling
Los Angeles Southwest College
1600 West Imperial Highway
Los Angeles, CA 90047

Margaret Dominici
Dean of Student Personnel Services
Shasta College
1065 North Old Oregon Trail
P.O. Box 6006
Redding, CA 96099

Charlene Russell
Student
593 Collins, #7
Merced, CA 95348

Maryanne Cox
Chairperson, Communication Skills
San Joaquin Delta College
5151 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95207

Juan Herrera
Student
1311 Carnell Court
San Diego, CA 92154

Robert Schooling
Director, Computing Services
Santa Rosa Junior College
1501 Mendocino Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95401

Robert Wickstrom
Director, Business Services
Sierra College
5000 Rocklin Road
Rocklin, CA 95677

Julie Slark
Research Coordinator
Rancho Santiago College
Seventeenth at Bristol
Santa Ana, CA 92706

Richard D. Ostrowski
Assistant Superintendent/ Vice President
Student Personnel Services
Butte College
3536 Butte Campus Drive
Oroville, CA 95965

Carmen Decker
Instructor, Language and Arts
Cypress College
9200 Valley View Street
Cypress, CA 90630

Loren R. Irwin
Vice President, Student Personnel
Merced College
3600 "M" Street
Merced, CA 95348-2898

Ex Officio - Participants

Judy Day
Department of Finance
1025 "P" Street
Room 427
Sacramento, CA 95814

Joan Sallee
California Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 - 12th Street
2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814

Robert Miyashiro
Legislative Budget Committee
925 "L" Street
Suite 1000
Sacramento, CA 95814

APPENDIX C

Matriculation Regional Advisory Committee

Region 1
Matt Jackson, Assistant Superintendent
Vice President, Student Services
Butte College
3536 Butte Campus Drive
Oroville, CA 95695
(916) 895-2511

Region 2
Ed Shenk
Dean of Student Enrollment Services
Napa Valley College
2277 Napa-Valley Highway
Napa, CA 94558
(707) 253-3109

Region 3
Dave Regan
Matriculation Coordinator
Santa Rosa Junior College
1501 Mendocino Avenue
Santa Rosa, CA 95401
(707) 527-4776

Region 4
Jon Kangas, District Dean
Academic Standards
San Jose-Evergreen CCD
4750 San Felipe Road
San Jose, CA 95135-1599
(408) 270-6466

Region 5
Phil Laughlin
Assistant Superintendent/Vice President
San Joaquin Delta College
5151 Pacific Avenue
Stockton, CA 95207
(209) 474-5047

Region 6
Marylin Orton, Associate Dean
Student Services
Allan Hancock College
800 South College Drive
Santa Maria, CA 93454
(805) 922-6966, Ext. 276

Region 7
Ernestine Moore,
Dean of Student Services
Pasadena City College
1570 East Colorado Boulevard
Pasadena, CA 91106
(818) 578-7071

Region 7 Alternate
Rochelle Hudson, Assistant Director
Office of Student Services
Los Angeles CCD
617 West Seventh Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 628-7788, Ext. 2375

Region 8
Lynn Stedman, Dean
Counseling and School Relations
Rancho Santiago College
Seventeenth at Bristol
Santa Ana, CA 92706
(714) 667-3032

Region 8 Alternate
Jannie MacKay
Matriculation Specialist
Long Beach City College
4901 East Carson Street
Long Beach, CA 90808
(213) 420-4049

Region 9
Inge Pelzer
Dean, Counseling
Chaffey College
5885 Haven Avenue
Rancho Cucamonga, CA 91701
(714) 987-1737

Region 10
Norma Hernandez
Dean of Student Services
Southwestern College
900 Otay Lakes Road
Chula Vista, CA 92010
(619) 421-6700, Ext. 239

Region 10 Alternate
Larry Brown
Dean of Students
San Diego City College
1313 Twelfth Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
(619) 230-2464

APPENDIX D

Matriculation Evaluation Advisory Council

Dr. William Anderson
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: Vocational Education

Dr. Janet Wilson Bowman
Compton Community College
1111 East Artesia Blvd.
Compton, CA 90221
Representing: CIOs

Ms. Rita Cepeda
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: Educ. Standards & Evaluation

Mr. Chuen-Rong Chan
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: Educ. Support Research

Ms. Jan Dennis-Rounds
Cerritos College
11110 East Alondra Blvd.
Norwalk, CA 90650
Representing: SCCCIRA

Ms. Marty Dunlap
Butte College
3536 Butte Campus Drive
Oroville, CA 95695
Representing: Assessment

Mr. Dean Eaton
Contra Costa College
2600 Mission Bell Drive
San Pablo, CA 94806
Representing: Admissions

Dr. Ronnald Farland
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: Academic Affairs

Dr. Alfred P. Fernandez
Coast Community College District
1370 Adams Avenue
Costa Mesa, CA 92626
(714) 432-5722

Dr. Jack Friedlander
Santa Barbara City College
721 Cliff Drive
Santa Barbara, CA 93109
Representing: Santa Barbara Fund for Instructional Improvement

Mr. Bill Hamre
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: MIS

Dr. Bob Harris
Sacramento City College
3835 Freeport Blvd.
Sacramento, CA 95822
Representing: CEOs

Dr. Catherine Johns
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: DSPS Research & Evaluation

Ms. Martha Kanter
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: Policy and Development

Mr. Harry Kawahara
Pasadena City College
1570 East Colorado Boulevard
Pasadena, CA 91106
Representing: Academic Senate

Ms. Patsy Maes-Erickson
San Diego City College
1313 Twelfth Avenue
San Diego, CA 92101
Representing: Counseling

Matriculation Evaluation Advisory Council *(Continued)*

Dr. Charles McIntyre
Chancellor's Office
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: Research and Analysis

Ms. Faye Pennington
P.O. Box 4537
Palm Desert, CA 92261
Representing: Associated Students

Mr. Dick Rasor
American River College
4700 College Oak Drive
Sacramento, CA 95841
Representing: NORCAL

Mr. Mike Reid
Palomar College
1140 West Mission Road
San Marcos, CA 92069
Representing: CISOs

Dr. Nancy Renkiewicz
Mission College
3000 Mission College Blvd.
Santa Clara, CA 95054
Representing: NORCAL

Mr. Thomas Rice
1557 Finegrove Avenue
Hacienda Heights, CA 91745
Representing: Associated Students (Alt)

Mr. Phil Rodriguez
Cerritos College
11110 East Alondra Blvd.
Norwalk, CA 90650
Representing: EOPS

Dr. Joan S. Sallee
CPEC
1020 12th Street, 3rd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Representing: CPEC

Mr. Harry Saterfield
Foothill College
12345 El Monte Road
Los Altos Hills, CA 94022
Representing: Academic Senate

Ms. Ruth Self
Chabot College
25555 Hesperian Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94545
Representing: CSSOs

Ms. Julie Slark
Rancho Santiago College
Seventeenth at Bristol
Santa Ana, CA 92706
Representing: SCCCIRA

Mr. Bill Spencer
DeAnza College
21250 Stevens Creek Road
Cupertino, CA 95014
Representing: DSPS

Mr. Scott Spicer
Glendale College
1500 North Verdugo road
Glendale, CA 91206
Representing: SCCCIRA

Ms. Evelyn Weiss
Golden West College
15722 Golden West Street
Huntington Beach, CA 92647
Representing: Academic Senate

Dr. McKinely Williams
College of Alameda
555 Atlantic Avenue
Alameda, CA 94501
Representing: NORCAL

Mr. Vic Willits
South County Community College District
25555 Hesperian Blvd.
Hayward, CA 94545
Representing: CBOs

APPENDIX E

Matriculation Assessment Advisory Panel

Del M. Anderson, Vice President Skyline College 3300 College Drive San Bruno, CA 94066	(415) 355-7000 CIO Council Appointee
Frank Gornick, Dean of Students Bakersfield College 1801 Panorama Drive Bakersfield, CA 93305	(209) 935-0801 CSSO Council Appointee
Robert Boyd Faculty Member, Business Education 1111 East Artesia Boulevard Compton, CA 90221	(213) 637-2660 Academic Senate Appointee
Gari Browning Faculty Member, ESL Orange Coast College P.O. Box 5005 Costa Mesa, CA 92628-0120	(714) 432-5595 Academic Senate Appointee
Vivian Calderon Director, Institutional Research City College of San Francisco 50 Phelan Avenue San Francisco, CA 94112	(415) 239-3227 Institutional Research Appointee
Tom Cantrell Faculty Member, Learning Disabilities Fullerton College 321 E. Chapman Avenue Fullerton, CA 92634	(714) 992-7270 CAPED Appointee
Rita Cepeda, Dean Education Standards and Evaluation Unit 1107 Ninth Street, Suite 400 Sacramento, CA 95814	(916) 322-6880 Panel Co-Chair
Elaine Cohen Dean of Instruction Appointee Santa Barbara City College 721 Cliff Drive Santa Barbara, CA 93109	(805) 965-0581 FII Matriculation Evaluation

Matriculation Assessment Advisory Panel *(Continued)*

Francis Condon 1812 E. Second Street Duarte, CA 91010	(818) 358-2628 Student Representative Citrus College
Phyllis Elame Counselor, EOPS Association Chabot College 25555 Hesperian Boulevard Hayward, CA 94545	(415) 786-6600 EOPS Association Appointee
Phyllis Goldman, Faculty Member Assessment Ctr./Dir., Research Coordinator Contra Costa College 2600 Mission Bell Drive San Pablo, CA 94806	(415) 235-7800 Academic Senate Appointee
Karen Halliday Disabled Student Services Appointee California Community Colleges 1107 Ninth Street, 2nd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	(916) 324-8487 Learning Disabilities
Al Harrison Controller/Finance Director Peralta CCD 333 East Eighth Street Oakland, CA 94606	(415) 466-7266 CBO Council Appointee
Edison Jackson Superintendent/President Compton CCD 1111 East Artesia Boulevard Compton, CA 90221	(213) 637-2660 CEO Council Appointee
Martha Kanter Assistant Deputy Chancellor California Community Colleges 1107 Ninth Street, 6th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	(916) 445-5849 Panel Co-Chair
Harry Kawahara Counselor Pasadena City College 1570 East Colorado Boulevard Pasadena, CA 91106	(818) 578-7123 Academic Senate Appointee

Matriculation Assessment Advisory Panel *(Continued)*

Dorothy Knoell, Administrator Calif. Postsecondary Education Commission 1020 12th Street, 3rd Floor Sacramento, CA 95814	(916) 445-1000 CPEC Representative
Creston Marshino Representative 310 N. Eastside, Apt. A Santa Ana, CA 92701	(714) 667-6973 Alternate Student Appointee
Robert Miyashiro Program Analyst Office of Legislative Analyst 925 L Street, Room 650 Sacramento, CA 95814	(916) 445-8641 LAO Representative
Norm Nicolson Management Information Systems Appointee Cerritos CCD 11110 East Alondra Boulevard Norwalk, CA 90650-9973	(213) 860-2451 MIS Ad Hoc Advisory Committee
Louise Sauseda Budget Analyst Department of Finance 915 L Street Sacramento, CA 95814	(916) 445-0328 DOF Representative
Rosa Perez Counselor, EOPS City College of San Francisco 50 Phelan Avenue San Francisco, CA 94112	(415) 239-3040 EOPS Statutory Advisory Committee
Jim Prager Faculty Member, English Yuba CCD 2088 North Beale Road Marysville, CA 95901	(916) 741-6760 Academic Senate Appointee
Shirley Trembley Faculty Member, Mathematics Bakersfield College 1801 Panorama Drive Bakersfield, CA 93305	(805) 395-4250 Academic Senate Appointee

Matriculation Assessment Advisory Panel *(Continued)*

Joseph Zagorski
Vice President
Mt. San Antonio CCD
100 North Grand Avenue
Walnut, CA 91789

(714) 594-5611
CIO Council Appointee

Additional Chancellor's Office Staff:
California Community Colleges
1107 Ninth Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

Susan Cota, Disabled Students Programs and Services
(916) 324-8487

Juan Cruz, Immigration Reform and Control Act
(916) 324-8486

Ronn Farland, Academic Affairs Division
(916) 445-2946

Bill Hamre, Management Information Systems
(916) 445-8753

James Meznek, Educational Policy
(916) 445-1606

Allene Murdoch, Educational Support Services
(916) 324-2348

Dale Rezabek, Greater Avenues for Independence
(916) 323-5958

Rod Tarrer, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services
(916) 323-6899

APPENDIX F

Matriculation Data Processing Allocations

1987-88

College Name	Total DP	Operating Expenses	Grand Total
Allan Hancock College	88,322.55	53,368.61	141,691.16
Allan Hancock Joint CCD	126,822.55*	53,368.61*	180,191.16*
Antelope Valley College	84,597.40	52,969.50	137,566.90
Antelope Valley CCD	123,097.40*	52,969.50*	176,066.90*
Barstow College	41,911.90	11,235.70	53,147.60
Barstow CCD	80,411.90*	11,235.70*	91,647.60*
Butte College	77,633.30	45,082.14	122,715.44
Butte CCD	116,133.30*	45,082.14*	161,215.44*
Cabrillo College	107,270.05	69,427.73	176,697.78
Cabrillo CCD	145,770.05*	69,427.73*	215,197.78*
Cerritos College	160,752.05	115,387.72	276,139.77
Cerritos CCD	199,252.05*	115,387.72*	314,639.77*
Chaffey College	101,878.95	63,975.78	165,854.73
Chaffey CCD	140,378.95*	63,975.78*	204,354.73*
Citrus College	98,282.50	63,386.12	161,668.62
Citrus CCD	136,782.50*	63,386.12*	200,168.62*
College of the Desert	64,298.55	36,757.75	101,056.30
Coachella Valley CCD	102,798.55*	36,757.75*	139,556.30*
Coastline Community College	107,713.35	72,421.51	180,134.86
Golden West College	137,957.85	99,758.99	237,716.84
Orange Coast College	191,296.85	148,599.95	339,896.80
Coast CCD	475,468.05*	320,780.45*	796,248.50*
Compton Community College	61,231.20	30,929.45	92,160.65
Compton CCD	99,731.20*	30,929.45*	130,660.65*
Contra Costa College	80,100.05	31,844.00	111,944.05
Diablo Valley College	166,507.80	133,481.00	299,988.80
Los Medanos College	73,657.90	54,749.00	128,406.90
Contra Costa CCD	358,765.75*	220,074.00*	578,840.20*
El Camino College	214,133.95	175,598.04	389,731.99
El Camino CCD	252,633.95*	175,598.04*	428,231.99*
DeAnza College	216,808.05	168,282.32	385,090.37
Foothill College	134,053.95	94,290.92	228,344.87
Foothill-DeAnza CCD	389,362.00*	262,573.24*	651,935.24*

Matriculation Data Processing Allocations *(Continued)*
1987-88

College Name	Total DP	Operating Expenses	Grand Total
Ohlone College	85,805.75	52,942.96	138,748.71
Fremont-Newark CCD	124,305.75*	52,942.96*	177,248.71*
Gavilan College	54,138.40	22,950.13	77,088.53
Gavilan Joint CCD	92,638.40*	22,950.13*	11,588.53*
Glendale Community College	109,858.35	71,624.24	181,482.59
Glendale CCD	148,358.35*	71,624.24*	219,982.59*
Cuyamaca College	50,370.35	21,571.74	71,942.09
Grossmont College	139,352.10	97,649.69	237,001.79
Grossmont-Cuyamaca CCD	228,222.45*	119,221.43*	347,443.88*
Hartnell College	76,446.40	41,324.27	117,770.67
Hartnell CCD	114,946.40*	41,324.27*	156,270.67*
Imperial Valley College	56,919.75	27,995.39	84,915.14
Imperial CCD	95,419.75*	27,995.39*	123,415.14*
Bakersfield College	103,602.10	69,520.63	173,122.73
Cerro Coso Community College	57,084.20	25,977.10	83,061.30
Porterville College	47,503.20	15,624.94	63,128.14
Kern CCD	246,689.50*	111,122.67*	357,812.17*
Lake Tahoe Community College	40,639.20	11,561.81	52,201.01
Lake Tahoe CCD	79,139.20*	11,561.81*	90,701.01*
Lassen College	44,600.30	14,662.72	59,263.02
Lassen CCD	83,100.30*	14,662.72*	97,763.02*
Long Beach City College	179,892.60	124,008.83	303,901.43
Long Beach CCD	218,392.60*	124,008.83*	342,401.43*
East Los Angeles College	117,780.55	87,69.17	205,649.72
Los Angeles City College	136,320.50	105,873.59	242,194.09
Los Angeles Harbor College	94,028.25	62,068.40	156,096.65
Los Angeles Mission College	65,220.90	37,627.07	102,847.97
Los Angeles Pierce College	162,410.85	124,281.85	286,692.70
Los Angeles Southwest College	60,401.80	32,095.49	92,497.29
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College	118,760.10	88,568.80	207,328.90
Los Angeles Valley College	160,044.20	125,323.70	285,367.90
West Los Angeles College	91,153.95	66,287.00	157,440.95
Los Angeles CCD	1,044,621.10*	729,995.07*	1,774,616.17*
American River College	167,787.65	124,383.29	292,170.94
Cosumnes River College	86,249.05	57,562.56	143,811.61
Sacramento City College	125,338.10	89,686.49	215,024.59
Los Rios CCD	417,874.80*	271,632.34*	689,507.14*
Marin Community College	91,490.00	56,725.48	148,215.48
Marin CCD	129,990.00*	56,725.48*	186,715.48*

Matriculation Data Processing Allocations *(Continued)*
1987-88

College Name	Total DP	Operating Expenses	Grand Total
Mendocino College	56,011.70	23,544.53	79,556.23
Mendocino-Lake CCD	94,511.70*	23,544.53*	118,056.23*
Merced College	75,002.10	43,309.38	118,311.48
Merced CCD	113,502.10*	43,309.38*	156,811.48*
MiraCosta College	73,536.35	43,060.06	116,596.41
MiraCosta CCD	112,036.35*	43,060.06*	155,096.41*
Monterey Peninsula College	77,533.20	50,134.98	127,668.18
Monterey Peninsula CCD	116,033.20*	50,134.98*	166,168.18*
Mt. San Antonio College	178,555.55	145,779.65	324,335.20
Mt. San Antonio CCD	217,055.55*	145,779.65*	362,835.20*
Mt. San Jacinto College	53,809.50	27,260.69	81070.19
Mt. San Jacinto CCD	92,309.50*	27,260.69*	119,570.19*
Napa Valley College	70,812.20	35,275.08	106,087.28
Napa Valley CCD	109,312.20*	35,275.08*	144,587.28*
Cypress College	121,705.90	81,548.86	203,254.76
Fullerton College	154,181.20	113,222.48	267,403.68
North Orange County CCD	314,387.10*	194,771.34*	509,158.44*
Palo Verde College	34,576.00	4,703.98	39,279.98
Palo Verde CCD	73,076.00*	4,703.98*	77,779.98*
Palomar College	136,256.15	96,915.94	233,172.09
Palomar CCD	174,756.15*	96,915.94*	271,672.09*
Pasadena City College	174,101.10	129,122.34	303,223.44
Pasadena Area CCD	212,601.10*	129,122.34*	341,723.44*
College of Alameda	67,709.10	36,035.38	103,744.48
Feather River College	36,363.50	5,919.31	42,282.81
Laney College	102,808.45	66,479.45	169,287.90
Merritt College	72,599.70	40,644.55	113,244.25
Vista College	52,422.40	21,523.39	73,945.79
Peralta CCD	370,403.15*	170,602.08*	541,005.23*
Rancho Santiago College	185,119.25	137,376.58	322,495.83
Rancho Santiago CCD	223,619.25*	137,376.58*	360,995.83*
College of the Redwoods	77,726.25	41,229.47	118,955.72
Redwoods CCD	116,226.25*	41,229.47*	157,455.72*
Rio Hondo College	118,295.35	80,419.79	198,715.14
Rio Hondo CCD	156,795.35*	80,419.79*	237,215.14*
Riverside Community College	133,224.55	94,242.58	227,467.13
Riverside CCD	171,724.55*	94,242.58*	265,967.13*

Matriculation Data Processing Allocations *(Continued)*
1987-88

College Name	Total DP	Operating Expenses	Grand Total
Irvine Valley College	64,849.10	32106.86	96,955.96
Saddleback College	137,686.15	93,888.02	231,574.17
Saddleback CCD	241,035.25*	125,994.88*	367,030.13*
Crafton Hills College	54,581.70	22,701.76	77,283.46
San Bernardino Valley College	105,110.75	71,246.94	176,357.69
San Bernardino CCD	198,192.45*	93,948.70*	292,141.15*
San Diego City College	119,167.65	86,066.08	205,233.73
San Diego Mesa College	158,721.45	121,629.35	280,350.80
San Diego Miramar College	61,738.85	31,046.05	92,784.90
San Diego CCD	378,127.95*	238,741.48*	616,869.43*
City College of San Francisco	195,915.75	150,865.67	346,781.42
San Francisco CCD	234,415.75*	150,865.67*	385,281.42*
San Joaquin Delta College	135,248.00	95,612.44	230,860.44
San Joaquin Delta CCD	173,748.00*	95,612.44*	269,360.44*
Evergreen Valley College	81,151.10	54,012.30	135,163.40
San Jose City College	99,898.40	72,942.91	172,841.31
San Jose-Evergreen CCD	219,549.50*	126,955.21*	346,504.71*
Cuesta College	77,440.25	49,248.60	126,688.85
San Luis Obispo County CCD	115,940.25*	49,248.60*	165,188.85*
Canada College	84,111.20	55,307.27	139,418.47
College of San Mateo	129,242.00	93,482.28	222,724.28
Skyline College	85,233.75	52,628.22	137,861.97
San Mateo County CCD	337,086.95*	201,417.77*	538,504.72*
Santa Barbara City College	105,489.70	69,779.44	175,269.14
Santa Barbara CCD	143,989.70*	69,779.44*	213,769.14*
College of the Canyons	55,589.85	23,627.00	79,216.85
Santa Clarita CCD	94,089.85*	23,627.00*	117,716.85*
Santa Monica College	163,404.70	118,703.82	282,108.52
Santa Monica CCD	201,904.70*	118,703.82*	320,608.52*
College of the Sequoias	85,341.00	51,267.84	136,608.84
College of the Sequoias CCD	123,841.00*	51,267.84*	175,108.84*
Shasta College	88,043.70	64,154.95	152,198.65
Shasta-Teh-Tri- Joint CCD	126,543.70*	64,154.95*	190,698.65*
Sierra College	105,589.80	70,129.25	175,719.05
Sierra Joint CCD	144,089.80*	70,129.25*	214,219.05*
College of the Siskiyous	47,417.40	16,236.40	63,653.80
Siskiyou Joint CCD	85,917.40*	16,236.40*	102,153.80*

Matriculation Data Processing Allocations *(Continued)*
1987-88

College Name	Total DP	Operating Expenses	Grand Total
Solano Community College	89,502.30	55,189.72	144,692.02
Solano County CCD	128,002.30*	55,189.72*	183,192.02*
Santa Rosa Junior College	196,466.30	133,602.59	330,068.89
Sonoma County Jr. CD	234,966.30*	133,602.59*	368,568.89*
Chabot College	172,306.45	123,318.68	295,625.13
South County CCD	210,806.45*	123,318.68*	334,125.13*
Southwestern College	114,899.10	80,480.46	195,379.56
Southwestern CCD	153,399.10*	80,480.46*	233,879.56*
Fresno City College	134,768.95	95,357.42	230,126.37
Kings River Community College	51,757.45	21,428.59	73,186.04
State Center CCD	225,026.40*	116,786.01*	341,812.41*
Moorpark College	100,513.30	63,887.62	164,400.92
Oxnard College	67,180.00	36,042.01	103,222.01
Ventura College	112,339.40	73,120.19	185,459.59
Ventura County CCD	318,532.70*	173,049.82*	491,582.52*
Victor Valley Community College	63,469.15	30,876.36	94,345.51
Victor Valley CCD	101,969.15*	30,876.36*	132,845.51*
West Hills College	47,088.50	16,188.05	63,276.55
West Hills CCD	85,588.50*	16,188.05*	101,776.55*
Taft College	36,527.95	6,025.49	42,553.44
West Kern CCD	75,027.95*	6,025.49*	81,053.44*
Mission College	100,377.45	64,358.77	164,736.22
West Valley College	127,747.65	85,783.57	213,531.22
West Valley-Mission CCD	266,625.10*	150,142.34*	416,767.44*
Columbia College	45,930.20	13,578.20	59,508.40
Modesto Junior College	101,878.95	62,290.24	164,169.19
Yosemite CCD	186,309.15*	75,868.44*	262,177.59*
Yuba College	86,556.50	54,130.80	140,687.30
Yuba CCD	125,056.50*	54,130.80*	179,187.30*
Total Colleges	13,369,238.15*	7,007,404.25*	20,376,641.34*

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges FEB 17 1989